DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 155 CE 029 302

AUTHOR Briggs, Vernon M., Jr.
TITLE Youth Employment Programs in the Southwest. Three Case Studies.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Bureau of Business Research.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 54p.
AVAILABLE FROM Bureau of Business Research, Box 7459, Austin, TX 78712 ($5.00; quantity discounts available).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Case Studies; City Government; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Employment Programs; Enrollment; Federal Government; Federal Programs; Federal State Relationship; Government Role; Job Placement; *Job Training; Participant Characteristics; *Program Development; *Program Implementation; Public Policy; Work Experience Programs; Young Adults; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS New Mexico (Albuquerque); Prime Sponsors; Texas (Corpus Christi); Texas (El Paso); *United States (Southwest); *Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act

ABSTRACT

This report presents planning, implementation, and first-year operational phases of Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) programs by prime sponsors in the Southwest. The prime sponsors were the city of Albuquerque and the encompassing county of Bernalillo, New Mexico; the Coastal Bend Manpower Consortium Area in Texas (administered by the city of Corpus Christi, Texas, plus 12 additional counties, most of which are rural); and the city and county of El Paso, Texas. Although widely separated in geographic location and significantly diverse in industrial composition, the three prime sponsor areas had several common key characteristics. All have large minority group populations (mostly Hispanics); all have large youth populations; all three are characterized as generally low-wage labor markets, are largely nonunion areas, and have serious poverty and unemployment problems. The report contains information on the following from the three case histories: knowledge development (no significant efforts undertaken); content and quality of work experience, including job quality and effects on the summer program for youth; youth participation and targeting, including participant characteristics and enrollment; substitution and overhead of the program; institutional change; changes at the local level; federal influences upon local planning and legislative uncertainties about Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) programs; and response of local administrators to federal policy decisions. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED203155

Youth Employment Programs in the Southwest

Three Case Studies

Vernon M. Briggs, Jr.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lois R. Glenn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Bureau of Business Research
University of Texas at Austin

© 1980, Bureau of Business Research
University of Texas at Austin
ISBN 87755-245-2

Contents

Description of Prime Sponsor Areas 1
Knowledge Development 7
Content and Quality of Work Experience 8
  Aggregate Effects 8
  Job Quality 9
  Effects on the Summer Program for Youth 10
  Local Education Agencies 12
Youth Participation and Targeting 15
  Youth Councils 15
  Youthful Clients 17
  Enrollment Activity 25
Substitution and Overhead 25
Institutional Change 29
  Youth Offices 29
  Private Sector 30
  Local Education Agencies 32
  Community-based Organizations 37
Changes at the Local Level 38
Federal Influences upon Local Planning and Legislative Uncertainties about CETA 40
Response of Local Administrators to Federal Policy Direction 42
Observations 43
Notes 47

Tables

1. Selected Population Characteristics for Three Southwestern Prime Sponsors 3
2. Total Allocations to Selected Prime Sponsors for CETA Titles I, II, III, and VI for Fiscal Years 1978 and 1979 5
3. Total Enrollments for Selected Prime Sponsors for CETA Titles I, II, III, and VI for Fiscal Year 1978 6
4. Approximate Percentages of YETP Funds Received by Local Education Agencies in Each Prime Sponsorship 13
5. Participant Characteristics of Enrollees in YCCIP and YETP of Three Southwestern Prime Sponsors, Total First Year through September 30, 1978 18
6. Participant Characteristics of Enrollees in YCCIP for Three Southwestern Prime Sponsors for the First Quarter of Fiscal Year 1979 (October 1, 1978-December 31, 1978) 20
7. Cumulative Enrollment by Program Activity by Fiscal Year Quarter for Youth Community Conservation Improvement Project Participants by Prime Sponsor 26
8. Cumulative Enrollment by Program Activity by Fiscal Year Quarter for Youth Employment and Training Program by Prime Sponsor 27
9. Enrollment of Youth in CETA Title I Programs for the First Quarter of Fiscal Years 1977, 1978, and 1979 by Prime Sponsor 28
10. Unspent YCCIP and YETP Funds from Fiscal Year 1978 43

Youth Employment Programs in the Southwest

Description of Prime Sponsor Areas

With the signing of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (YEDPA) on August 5, 1977, a national decision to spend substantial sums and to encourage a variety of program initiatives to meet the employment needs of youth was codified into law. The legislation took the form of a series of amendments to the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) of 1973 and was implemented through the CETA system of local prime sponsors. This report presents planning, implementation, and first-year operational phases of YEDPA by three prime sponsors in the Southwest. The prime sponsors were the city of Albuquerque and the encompassing county of Bernalillo, New Mexico; the Coastal Bend Manpower Consortium Area in Texas (administered by the city of Corpus Christi, Texas, plus twelve additional counties, most of which are rural); and the city and county of El Paso, Texas. Although widely separated in geographic location and significantly diverse in industrial composition, the three prime sponsor areas had several key common characteristics. All have large minority group populations (mostly Hispanics); all have large youth populations; all three are characterized as generally low-wage labor markets, are largely nonunion areas, and have serious poverty and unemployment problems. As wages are low and employment opportunities are limited for adult workers, adults and youths engage in more direct competition in the local labor markets than is generally the case elsewhere in the nation. It is true, however, that the aggregate unemployment rate did decline in all three labor markets during the first year of YEDPA's operation. Only in El Paso did the aggregate unemploy-

ment rate remain substantially higher than the national rate (see table 1).

A highlighted summary of the population and economic characteristics for the chosen prime sponsors is presented in table 1. In each locality, one city numerically dominates the service area. The city of Albuquerque accounts for approximately 77 percent of the population of Bernalillo County, the city of Corpus Christi for approximately 85 percent of Nueces County and 48 percent of the twelve-county consortium, and the city of El Paso accounts for 94 percent of El Paso County.

The Albuquerque labor market is dominated by the government sector. Approximately 28 percent of the labor market is employed by various government agencies. Most government employees are federal—they are associated with various military installations and missile-testing facilities as well as with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Federal Aviation Agency. In addition, the University of New Mexico is located in the city. The private sector is composed largely of service industries with the manufacturing and construction industries being small both in numbers and in operational size.

The Coastal Bend area of Texas contains one major city, Corpus Christi, plus an additional twelve counties. Aside from Nueces County, which contains Corpus Christi, the counties of the Coastal Bend are quite small in population (e.g., five had populations of fewer than 10,000 people in 1973). Five counties have lost population since 1970. The remainder have shown slight population increases resulting essentially from natural growth factors. The population of the area is increasing but at a much lower rate than is that of the state of Texas. The local economy is geared heavily toward retail and wholesale industries (partly because the city of Corpus Christi is a major seaport on the Gulf of Mexico). The trade sectors combined account for 34 percent of all employment in the area. Personal services account for an additional 19 percent of employment. These low-wage and labor-intensive sectors sustain the greatest employment growth and, based on projected growth of tourism, will expand most rapidly in the future. Manufacturing, although accounting for 12 percent of total employment, is substantial only in Nueces County. Manufacturing is dominated by chemical and petroleum products, which tend to be

highly capitalized operations with little prospect for employment expansion.

The location of El Paso on the U.S.-Mexico border has resulted in a local labor market dominated by the retail and wholesale trade sector. Retail and wholesale trade accounts for approximately 23 percent of total employment. Manufacturing is a large part of the local economy (about 18 percent of total employment) but this aggregate figure masks the fact that the low-wage textile industry accounts for half of all jobs in manufacturing. The government sector, as is the case all along the border, is a substantial provider of jobs, with over 20 percent of all employed persons in this sector. Although the populations of the city and county are among the most rapidly growing in Texas, the local labor market has not been able to provide a commensurate number of jobs. The local labor market has a considerable surplus. The substantial number of daily commuting workers and illegal aliens from Mexico in the El Paso work force contributes to the prevailing low-wage structure and the shortage of jobs.

Thus, for different reasons, all three areas under study tend to be low-wage labor markets. All are sustaining some measure of growth, but all have serious employment and income problems. Each also has a population with a very high proportion of minority group members and a high proportion of people (both adults and youths) in need of manpower services.

The YEDPA program is, of course, only one portion of the overall CETA activities in each locality. As both an indication of the importance of YEDPA and of the significance of YEDPA to other CETA activities in each community, the funding and enrollment levels of the various CETA titles are given in tables 2 and 3. In addition to these programs, both Albuquerque and the Coastal Bend have Skill Training Improvement Programs (STIP), and the Coastal Bend was the recipient of a substantial planning grant for the Employment Opportunity Program (a welfare reform demonstration program) that could provide an additional 3,200 public service employment jobs if it goes into effect. In each community, the prime sponsors and CETA are highly visible. In Albuquerque, the present mayor is a former director of the prime sponsor. High poverty levels, media, and local politicians have given CETA more attention in these communities than is

Table 1

Selected Population Characteristics for Three Southwestern Prime Sponsors

Prime sponsor	Population 1978	Population growth rate since 1970	Percentage of population with Spanish surnames, 1970	Percentage of population who are black, 1970	Percentage of population who are native American, 1970	Number of people in need of manpower services* 1978	Civilian labor force October 1978	Unemployment rate October 1978
Bernalillo County, N.M. (including city of Albuquerque)	384,200	21.7	39.0	2.1	1.8	85,000	196,700	5.8
Coastal Bend Manpower Consortium, Texas (including city of Corpus Christi)†	440,700	4.8	47.0	3.9	less than 0.5	75,000	182,305	4.6
El Paso County, Texas (including city of El Paso)	443,400	23.4	56.8	2.9	less than 0.5	100,444	164,800	8.2

*Includes estimates of unemployed, discouraged workers, involuntary part-time employed, and those employed full time but who have incomes below the poverty threshold.

†Consortium includes the following counties: Aransas, Bee, Brooks, Duval, Jim Wells, Kenedy, Kleberg, Live Oak, McMullen, Nueces, Refugio, and San Patricio.

Source: All data, with one exception, are from U.S. Bureau of the Census or U.S. Department of Labor publications. The column that gives the number of people in need of manpower services was compiled from data supplied by the prime sponsors.

Table 2

Total Allocations to Selected Prime Sponsors for CETA Titles I, II, III, and VI for Fiscal Years 1978 and 1979
(In millions of dollars)

Prime sponsor	Fiscal year	Title I	Title II	Title III			Title VI
				SPEDY*	YCCIP†	YETP§	
Albuquerque and Bernalillo County, New Mexico	1978	3.3	2.7	1.1	0.2	0.8	12.3
	1979	3.3	4.9	1.1	0.2	0.8	7.3
Coastal Bend Manpower Consortium, Texas	1978	3.7	1.8	1.5	0.1	0.8	8.0
	1979	3.8	3.9	1.4	0.2	0.8	4.3
City and County of El Paso, Texas	1978	3.3	2.0	1.2	0.2	1.2	11.9
	1979	3.7	6.3	n.a.	0.2	1.0	10.1

*SPEDY = Summer program for economically disadvantaged youth.
†YCCIP = Youth community conservation and improvement project.
§YETP = Youth employment and training program.
Note: Albuquerque also received a tier II grant under the youth incentive entitlement pilot project of $1,106,000 for the eighteen-montn period of January 1978 through June 30, 1979, and an additional $816,105 for July 1, 1979, through June 1, 1980.
Source: Region VI Office of U.S. Department of Labor.

Table 3

Total Enrollments for Selected Prime Sponsors for CETA Titles I, II, III, and VI for Fiscal Year 1978

Prime sponsor	Title I	Title II	Title III			Title VI
			SPEDY*	YCCIP†	YETP§	
Albuquerque and Bernalillo County, New Mexico	3,117	540	1,524	91	472	2,212
Coastal Bend Manpower Consortium, Texas	1,987	349	2,000	79	897	2,432
City and County of El Paso, Texas	2,838	657	1,138	136	605	2,435

*SPEDY = Summer program for economically disadvantaged youth.
†YCCIP = Youth community conservation and improvement project
§YETP = Youth employment and training program.
Source: Region VI Office of U.S. Department of Labor.

normally the case. The actions of all three prime sponsors tend to be highly visible in their areas.

Knowledge Development

All three prime sponsors expressed an interest in learning what was happening to the participants in the YEDPA program and what lessons could be learned from the YEDPA experience; yet, the crisis that surrounded every stage of YEDPA's life precluded serious efforts to study its impact. The planning period for YEDPA was inadequate (in most instances planning took less than a month); the implementation phase in early 1978 was parallelled by "a frantic effort" by the U.S. Department of Labor to build up participant levels in other CETA programs (i.e., public service employment programs); and the operational phase was plagued by uncertainty over CETA reauthorization and the chaos over funding levels for fiscal year 1979 during the August-December 1979 period. Hence, the prime sponsors gave little time or effort to assessment of programs. Officials of the prime sponsors, however, have shared numerous anecdotal experiences that reflect new insights about youth labor market problems. These insights, however, tend to pertain to needs for institutional adjustments. All prime sponsors are dubious of the efficacy of any formal statistical evaluation of YEDPA's impact. One official candidly stated that to learn anything from YEDPA will require "a keen understanding and extensive interpretation of the numbers given the complexity of the legislation and the variation in target groups between projects."[1]

The only experimental project in the three prime sponsor areas was created by the Corpus Christi Independent School District and involved two separate classes each with two groups of students from families of mixed income backgrounds. The groups were made up of students enrolled in regular vocational education classes. Half of each set were students from low-income family backgrounds (i.e., CETA eligibles), and the other half were from higher-income family backgrounds (i.e., not eligible for CETA). Teachers were not told which group a particular student was from.

Although the sample sizes were too small to be scientifically valid for formal research, a report on the two groups by the staff of the school district suggested that those eligible for CETA completed the classes more successfully than those who were not eligible. The conclusion was that the CETA eligibles had more to gain by completing the classes than did those who were not eligible and had relatively less need for the income received from the work experience. On the other hand, the noneligibles who stayed with the program received more favorable work site evaluations from their supervisors than did those who were eligible. The school district report, however, concluded that "the test did not reveal any significant facts" about the potential merits of mixed-income classes.

Apparently no detailed evaluation of program operations during the first year was made a criterion for refunding during the second year. Most first-year program operators who sought refunding from the prime sponsors for the second year were successful in their applications. Where there was competition, decisions to award were based largely upon a comparison of the proposals with those of other applicants rather than upon a review of past performance by the prime sponsors.

In defense of the prime sponsors, it must be said that they simply had no time to evaluate before decisions had to be made for second-year funding. Monitoring—to the degree that very limited funds and staff time are available—is done by the prime sponsors, but evaluation is not. One prime sponsor did indicate an intention to evaluate the performances of project operators during fiscal year 1979, the second year, but admitted that "there has simply not been any time this year [fiscal year 1978] for such activities." Decisions concerning refunding of individual programs for the second year were based more on "assumptions drawn from personal impressions than from formal evaluations."

Content and Quality of Work Experience

Aggregate Effects

The prime sponsors in all three localities report that the net effect of YEDPA was additional employment for youth in their

localities. In Albuquerque, if the entitlement program is included, then service to youth has increased substantially from periods before the introduction of YEDPA. Measuring the actual impact in any of the prime sponsor areas, however, is virtually impossible because the Youth Employment and Training Program (YETP) and Youth Community Conservation Improvement Program (YCCIP) were essentially in operation for only two quarters of 1978 (April 1–September 30, 1978). The lack of adequate planning meant that virtually none of the youth programs was in operation before mid-February 1978 despite intentions to begin before that date. Many began in March 1978, but most were not fully operational until April 1978. A few did not begin until the summer of 1978, when others were phasing out. The first quarter of 1979 was a lost quarter because of uncertainty about CETA reauthorizations and delays in refunding. Hence, a study of quarterly data reports cannot provide any meaningful measures of the aggregate impact of YEDPA. During fiscal year 1978 the participation of youth in Title I was not apparently affected significantly by the buildup of the YEDPA Title III program and its additional enrollments.

Job Quality

Because of the types of jobs involved, much of the quality depended upon the adequacy of supervision. Impressions based upon a number of on-site visits and interviews with some participants and supervisors suggest several trends.

First, the quality of jobs being provided to YETP participants is much better than the quality of those generally available to YCCIP enrollees. The YCCIP jobs tend to be similar in content in all three prime sponsor areas: cleanup and maintenance. Thus, if the test of the program's success is whether work is being done that probably would not be done in the absence of YCCIP, then YCCIP is a success. If skill transferability is the test, it is not a success. In either case, work is being done, work habits are being learned, and income is being provided to youth who are almost exclusively from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. The work is largely unskilled and, as such, the quality of the jobs is generally low. YETP participants, on the other hand, seem to be exposed to a much wider variety of jobs. Although the jobs

also seem to require unskilled labor, the settings in which the participants work and the supportive services they receive do seem to offer them more opportunities to see how the job they have can function as a step up the job ladder. YETP participants are also more likely to work in jobs that are similar to those of some full-time public employees.

Second, in YETP supervision is more likely to be given by adults than in YCCIP. In some instances YCCIP project supervisors are other YCCIP youth. In YETP jobs, the supervisors are usually the same people who are in charge of full-time public employees.

Third, as implied above, YETP participants usually work in regular jobs with regular employees. YCCIP participants usually work in separate projects that are especially created for them. Jobs in the YCCIP projects are not intended to provide long-run benefits to the participants.

Fourth, in both YETP and YCCIP the emphasis is on the provision of services and minor maintenance as opposed to the creation of permanent and tangible output. Undoubtedly, the barriers to providing work in construction projects have affected the job mix. By concentrating on intangible services, YEDPA is being denied the ability to build long-run monuments (such as those available to the work projects of the New Deal era) that future generations will be able to point to with pride. Although interest in tangible work exists at the local level, the fear of union opposition as well as the lack of adequate parallel funds for capital materials and tools has largely precluded this option.

Effects on the Summer Program for Youth

For the most part, the large reservoir of needy youth in all three areas meant that finding sufficient participants for all of the regular summer youth programs was not difficult. In Albuquerque and El Paso, YCCIP and YETP were kept separate from summer enrollments under the existing CETA Title I and the Summer Program for Economically Disadvantaged Youth (SPEDY) under Title III. In the Coastal Bend, the programs run by the school system were blended together.

In the Coastal Bend program, officials originally intended to expend all of the YETP funds received by the school district in

the first six months of 1978 and then to move the participants into SPEDY positions for the summer; but because YETP started late, considerable overlap into the summer occurred. The combination of available SPEDY and YETP funds meant that total summer enrollments were expanded considerably over the planned level. As the YETP funds were depleted, the participants were transferred to SPEDY or Title I slots. Some administrative difficulties arose because of the different income eligibility criteria that apply to SPEDY and to YETP, but "the administrative tangle was overcome." School officials, however, strongly recommended that these income criteria be standardized.

The types of jobs during the summer were the same as those provided during the school year, with the difference that during the school year part-time jobs were emphasized and during the summer full-time employment was. Wage rates did not differ. The federal minimum wage remained the standard for virtually everyone except those participants with some supervisory duties over other youths. Programs for out-of-school youth (those who have dropped out or graduated) did tend to pay slightly higher wages.

Some minor problems occurred in the localities in which SPEDY, YETP, and YCCIP coexisted during the summer months. In a few instances, youth tried to get two jobs. More importantly, some youths preferred SPEDY jobs to YEDPA jobs because SPEDY jobs contained some of the more attractive (for noneconomic reasons) jobs. For instance, in El Paso the SPEDY program had a number of jobs in recreational occupations (lifeguards, supervisors for basketball programs, etc.). Since the pay was the same, SPEDY jobs seemed to be an easier and a more enjoyable way of working during the summer. YEDPA jobs in the summer had much the same job requirements throughout the school year. The efforts by enrollees to shift between programs, however, were the exceptions.

In Albuquerque, the presence of an experimental Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Project (YIEPP) did result in fewer 16-year-old and 17-year-old youths to be available for SPEDY than had been in previous years. Accordingly, SPEDY was confronted with more 14-year-old and 15-year-old youths than it had been

in earlier years. This development, however, was seen as being a positive sign as it enabled "more youth than ever to be served."

None of the prime sponsors reported any indication of labor shortages in youth-dominated occupations during the summer months. The vast surpluses of employable youths in their communities overshadowed the presence of sizable SPEDY and YEDPA programs. No employers were reported to have complained about shortages of youthful job seekers, although there were some complaints about shortages of youths with job skills. (These complaints, however, were considered to be routine and unrelated to YEDPA.) The prime sponsors are quick to indicate that their youth programs are largely reserved for economically disadvantaged youth. They point out that "there are still plenty of non-economically disadvantaged youth around."

Local Education Agencies

The fact that YEDPA mandated that the local education agencies receive at least 22 percent of the YETP allocation caused no particular difficulties in the three prime sponsor areas. A few had had qualms that the schools would only be interested in serving youngsters who were still in school. Prime sponsors (who believed the programs' goal was job placement) and school officials (who thought it was to keep youth in school) disagreed about the ultimate evaluation criteria for the programs.

Choosing recipients for the funds was relatively simple. Albuquerque has only one school system that covers the entire administrative area of the prime sponsor. The Coastal Bend area has almost fifty independent school systems; however, an agreement executed several years before gave the Corpus Christi Independent School District administrative responsibility for all CETA youth programs for the entire area. Thus, YEDPA required no special accommodation.

El Paso County has two large school systems as well as eight small rural districts. Both of the large districts are among the biggest in Texas. The larger of the two is El Paso Independent School District (EPISD, the fifth largest system in Texas), and the other is Ysleta Independent School District (the seventh largest in Texas). The EPISD, has, in the past, served as the sponsor for all in-school manpower programs for all school districts in the

cour y. In the case of YEDPA, both of the large school systems received funding under YETP, but they restricted their programs to their own school boundaries. EPISD also received substantial funds from YCCIP for its own district.

Except in El Paso no real changes in funding percentage for local education agencies (LEAs) occurred between fiscal year 1978 and fiscal year 1979 (see table 4). In El Paso funding percentages increased.

The LEAs in each of the three prime sponsor areas operated three entirely different programs. Albuquerque initiated a special program with the local hospitality industry and used all of its funds for this single endeavor. The Corpus Christi Independent School District expanded and enriched the comprehensive in-school and dropout prevention program that it already had in existence. The El Paso independent schools introduced nonprofit job sites. The Ysleta Independent School District (in the El Paso prime sponsor area) introduced a teacher's aid program for school-age mothers that sought to teach day-care preparation. The EPISD added at its vocational-technical school a program in fiscal year

Table 4

Approximate Percentages of YETP Funds Received by Local Education Agencies in Each Prime Sponsorship*

Prime sponsor area	Percentage of YETP funds received	
	Fiscal year 1978	Fiscal year 1979
Albuquerque–Bernalillo County		
Albuquerque public schools**	22	22
Coastal Bend Manpower Consortium		
Corpus Christi Independent School District†	72	70
El Paso and El Paso County		
El Paso Independent School District††	28	40
Ysleta Independent School District	13	20
Fabens Independent School District	–	5

*These percentages are approximate since funds were carried over for fiscal year 1979 and original allocations were reallocated and modified.

**In addition, APS also received a significant three-year grant under the entitlement section of YEDPA.

†CCISD uses its funds to cover the entire twelve-county consortium area.

††EPISD also has received almost 60 percent of the total YCCIP funds for both fiscal years.

1979 that sought placements in the private sector with the intention that such a program would lead eventually to permanent placements. All of the programs are directed toward the economically disadvantaged.

The relation between the prime sponsors and the LEAs is uniformly cooperative. The LEAs are frustrated by the uncertainties and administrative requirements of YEDPA, but they do not blame the prime sponsors for the problems. As they all (except for the Ysleta Independent School District) have had extensive experience with CETA (i.e., Title I programs for youth and summer youth programs), they have become accustomed to its problems. YETP, however, does introduce a new set of problems since it operates as a year-round, in-school program. The sychronization of funds to the school year is essential if school employment and training programs are to become a permanent addition to CETA operations.

All of the LEAs provide academic credit for the work experience and the classes required for YETP participants. Although academic credit for work experience was already available in Albuquerque, YEDPA is credited in Texas for making this concept possible in the participating school districts. Academic credit for work experience was not possible in most circumstances in Texas schools at that time, except for those youth enrolled in YEDPA programs. In all instances, there is a requirement that the students attending receive some classroom instruction in work habits, job orientation, and self-assertiveness. In some instances, students do not have to take the classroom instruction every term, but they must do so for the first term in which they are enrolled in the program. The academic worthiness of the program is determined exclusively by the local school districts and their respective state educational agencies. The prime sponsors are not involved in the process and seem content to leave it that way for the present. External monitoring by any state agencies, other than the requirements that they obtain advanced approval from their respective state agencies, does not seem to be involved.

Youth Participation and Targeting

Youth Councils

In all three prime sponsor areas, local participation by youths in the planning of YEDPA activities was essentially nonexistent. All three, of course, set up youth councils and all had youths as members, but in no instance can it be said that the youths contributed to local program design or implementation of YEDPA. To begin with, youths did not constitute more than 10 percent to 20 percent of the membership of the youth councils. Because so many local constituencies were required to be represented on the youth councils, the number of youths could not be made substantial without making the total membership of the council too extensive to be workable. As it was, the youth councils usually had around twenty members. Experience with those youth who did serve on the councils implies that the real problem was not the number of youth but the very concept of youth participation itself. In fact, the legislation and its associated rules, regulations, and guidelines are too complicated for most citizens (regardless of age) to understand. In addition, the adults on the councils represent some special interest group—either public or private; most of the adults were also members of the overall planning councils of the respective prime sponsors. Since the adults have over the years built up a considerable amount of expertise about CETA programs, youths who did attend meetings were often intimidated. Absenteeism was a problem among youth members (especially for emergency meetings called on short notice) and youth members who did come were usually silent and acquiescent. Even when they did speak up it was never clear whose views they were expressing. As a result, the consensus in all three localities was that the requirement for youth participation was largely window dressing. As one official stated, "it sounds good, but it simply does not work."

Although none of the prime sponsors assigned high priority to this problem, all had ideas about changes that might make youth councils more effective. One suggested that the youth advisory committee should be made up entirely of youth and the regular planning councils be made up only of political officials. If neces-

sary, technical committees could be created to advise on certain special issues. Another prime sponsor felt that the problem might be reduced if older youth were appointed rather than those of high school age. Another felt that a mandated percentage of youths should be required, that the percentage should be high, and that youths who were actually in the programs should be the council members.

In all cases, however, the prime sponsor indicated that the inadequacies of the youth councils reflected a much bigger problem that plagued all of the prime sponsors. Namely, the entire concept of planning itself is impossible under the prevailing CETA system. As one official stated:

> DOL does not plan. That is the heart of the problem. It does zero planning but it expects us to plan. They rush everything which means that all we can do is implement programs. We are still getting issuances on YEDPA. You cannot plan at the local level without all of the rules and regulations being known in advance. We simply cannot tell city officials that this is what we think we want to do now but we will probably have to change it all later when the precise rules and regulations are known. Because DOL doesn't plan, we can't. It's that simple.

Another official lamented that "the problems that prime sponsors deal with are largely unsolvable—they usually involve very technical issues and impossible deadlines." As a result, he continued:

> All advisory councils are a waste of dollars and time. The process is good for the staff who have to anticipate questions from the council members but it is usually only questions and not input that we get from the councils. Moreover, the decisions that the councils do make are largely based on local political considerations and not program welfare. Nonetheless, DOL requires advisory committees for almost everything.

Another planner added that the usual case is that "the councils get angry with us because they are usually asked to act under extreme time pressures which give little allowance for real deliberation or study of issues and alternatives." The fact that many of the members are elected politicians and that the nonpolitician members are all appointed by politicians guarantees that political considerations are likely to be paramount in the decision-making process. Hence, many of the inadequacies of the youth councils

are clearly reflections of larger problems that pertain both to the lack of a true planning role for the prime sponsors and the questionable utility of advisory councils in the CETA system.

Youthful Clients

Table 5 contains the cumulative enrollee characteristics for the first fiscal year (October 1, 1978-September 30, 1979) for the enrollees in the Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Project (YCCIP) and the Youth Employment and Training Program (YETP). Because of changes in the reporting forms, table 6 was prepared to provide the program data for the first quarter of fiscal year 1979. It should be noted that all of the prime sponsors warn that the data for the October 1, 1978-December 31, 1978 period are grossly distorted because of uncertainties over CETA reauthorization and delayed funding decisions. In the Coastal Bend area, for instance, no one enrolled in YCCIP during the quarter. Many enrollees in YETP in all three areas were only carryovers or people who were enrolled near the end of the quarter.

YCCIP, which is essentially a public service employment program for youth, was by far the smaller of the two programs in funding. Moreover, since it was designed largely to create jobs, it received less attention from the prime sponsors. YETP, on the other hand, was designed to offer a variety of job-related services to youths as well as to provide employment opportunities. It was relatively more complex than YCCIP. YETP funds also contained a requirement that at least 22 percent of its funds had to go to the local school systems (i.e., the local education agencies or LEAs).

Because of the ethnic composition of the local communities under review, it is not really surprising that virtually all participants have been from ethnic and racial minorities. Although persons from Hispanic backgrounds clearly dominate, it is apparent that blacks have been given ample opportunities to participate in the Coastal Bend program. In Albuquerque, although it is not immediately obvious from tables 3 and 4, blacks have also been given special attention because Albuquerque was a recipient of a Tier II grant for a Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Project

Table 5

Participant Characteristics of Enrollees in YCCIP and YETP of Three Southwestern Prime Sponsors, Total First Year through September 30, 1978

Characteristic	Albuquerque-Bernalillo County, N.M.				Coastal Bend Manpower Consortium, Tex.				El Paso and El Paso County, Tex.			
	YCCIP		YETP		YCCIP		YETP		YCCIP		YETP	
	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage
Sex												
Male	75	82	195	41	69	87	343	38	129	95	258	43
Female	16	18	277	59	10	13	554	62	7	5	347	57
Age												
Under 18 years	66	73	251	53	49	62	483	54	106	78	548	91
18 and over	25	27	221	47	30	38	414	46	30	22	57	9
Ethnic group												
Anglo	4	4	1	0	5	6	63	7	2	1	5	1
Hispanic	78	86	271	88	73	92	665	74	132	97	555	92
Black	4	4	22	7	1	1	165	18	2	1	17	3
Indian	5	6	13	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	2
Economically disadvantaged	89	98	357	76	47	59	830	93	114	84	511	84
AFDC family	48	53	48	10	10	13	250	28	35	26	164	27

Education level												
High school student	65	71	186	40	36	46	475	53	127	93	429	71
High school dropout	12	13	53	11	35	44	254	28	0	0	54	9
High school graduate	14	15	233	49	8	10	168	19	9	7	122	20
Labor market status												
Unemployed	9	10	107	23	1	1	273	30	0	0	17	3
Underemployed	1	1	39	8	54	68	8	1	2	1	236	39
Other	81	89	326	69	24	31	616	69	134	99	352	58
Miscellaneous												
Offender	20	22	20	4	0	0	8	1	0	0	9	2
Handicapped	3	3	3	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	5	1

Table 6

Participant Characteristics of Enrollees in YCCIP and YETP for Three Southwestern Prime Sponsors for the First Quarter of Fiscal Year 1979 (October 1, 1978–December 31, 1978)

Characteristic	Albuquerque-Bernalillo County, N.M.				Coastal Bend Manpower Consortium, Tex.				El Paso and El Paso County, Tex.			
	YCCIP		YETP		YCCIP		YETP		YCCIP		YETP	
	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage	Total*	Percentage	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage
Sex												
Male	32	91	24	20	–	–	83	30	47	98	97	31
Female	3	9	91	80	–	–	196	70	1	2	212	69
Age												
Under 19 years	34	97	85	74	–	–	245	88	47	98	296	96
19 and over	1	3	30	26	–	–	34	12	1	2	13	4
Ethnic group												
Anglo	4	11	20	17	–	–	19	6	4	8	11	4
Hispanic	30	86	86	75	–	–	216	77	43	90	290	94
Black	1	3	4	3	–	–	44	16	1	2	7	2
Indian	0	0	0	0	–	–	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	5	4	–	–	0	0	0	0	1	0
Economically disadvantaged	34	97	104	90	–	–	251	90	48	100	299	97
Economic status												
AFDC family	8	23	13	11	–	–	75	27	2	4	28	9
Public assistance	6	17	8	7	–	–	13	5	0	0	0	0
70% of BLS lower living standard	33	94	103	90	–	–	163	58	46	96	271	88
71% to 85% of BLS lower living standard	0	0	8	7	–	–	23	8	0	0	10	3
Above 85% of BLS lower living standard	2	6	4	3	–	–	0	0	0	0	0	0

Education level												
High school student	24	69	31	27	–	–	180	64	45	94	274	89
High school dropout	4	11	16	14	–	–	75	27	2	4	5	2
High school graduate	6	17	66	57	–	–	19	7	1	2	19	6
Post high school	1	3	2	2	–	–	5	2	0	0	11	4
Labor market status												
Unemployed	5	14	61	53	–	–	85	30	2	4	22	7
Underemployed	1	3	7	6	–	–	2	1	0	0	0	0
Other	29	83	47	41	–	–	192	69	46	96	287	93
Miscellaneous												
Offender	4	11	2	2	–	–	0	0	0	0	1	0
Handicapped	2	6	3	3	–	–	3	1	0	0	1	0

*No enrollees in the program during this quarter because of funding uncertainties.

(YIEPP).[2] The YIEPP program was placed in the area of Albuquerque where the black population is most concentrated. YETP and YCCIP, in turn, do not serve that area of the city; hence, black participation in these programs is understandably not high. In El Paso the low black participation rate reflects the fact that blacks make up less than 3 percent of the local population.

Female participation in YCCIP is significantly below that in YETP in all three prime sponsor jurisdictions. Male participation in YETP is significantly lower than female participation. In the case of YCCIP, the nature of the jobs (physicial and out-of-doors work) is cited as the explanation for the paucity of female participation and, also, for the fact that many of the women who did participate dropped out. As for YETP, it is not immediately apparent why female participation should be considerably higher than that of males. The diversity of projects and the multiple number of sponsors would make it unlikely that female participation was encouraged by design. The explanation may be that the school systems are deeply involved in YETP operations. Women are likely to be more evenly represented with men in schools than, perhaps, in other societal institutions. Another plausible explanation is that several large YETP ventures involve training and work experience sites in occupations that have been traditionally dominated by women (e.g., secretarial training programs and job sites with day-care facilities, libraries, and hospitals). Also, in El Paso, the YWCA operated in fiscal year 1978 a program that involved only female participants. Likewise in fiscal year 1979 in both Albuquerque and El Paso, YETP funded programs for women, of high school age, who were either pregnant or already mothers.

The YCCIP programs have enrolled predominately youths under age 18, a somewhat surprising fact because the school systems were not involved in YCCIP in Albuquerque or the Coastal Bend Consortium area. In El Paso, however, the school system administered a substantial portion of the YCCIP grant in fiscal year 1978. YETP, on the other hand, has had a fairly equal representation of youths under 18 and youths over 18 in both Albuquerque and in the Coastal Bend area. Again, however, El Paso is clearly the exception because most of its YETP youths were under 18. Part of the explanation is the fact that the other

two school systems had large YETP programs. The other is that the YMCA program (designed as a dropout prevention program) and the YWCA program (counseling and work experiences) both focused on youths of high school age.

Clearly most of the participants are from economically disadvantaged families. Fewer, but still a significantly high number given the restrictive welfare programs in both of these states, were from families receiving Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

Under YEDPA, participation in YCCIP and YETP was not specifically targeted for economically disadvantaged youth (i.e., those from families with incomes of 70 percent or less of the lowest living standard set up by the Bureau of Labor Statistics). Also in the program are persons from families in the range of 70 percent to 85 percent of the Bureau of Labor Statistics lowest living standard and those from families whose income is above the 85 percent standard. The prime sponsors were asked, however, to give preference to the economically disadvantaged. As can be seen from tables 4 and 5, all of the prime sponsors have complied.

All of the prime sponsors report that they are carefully checking the actual eligibility of applicants, but the matter is not as simple as it sounds. The easiest situation occurs when the youth is from a family that is also receiving public welfare assistance. In other cases, checks are made to verify the actual income of the parents if the youth is still living at home. Youths who live alone and who are family heads are more difficult to deal with: it is, for example, more difficult to verify their actual incomes, especially if they are receiving help from their parents but are not claimed as dependents by their parents.

The Coastal Bend Manpower Consortium encompasses not only the city of Corpus Christi but also twelve rural counties. Both the 85 percent of lowest living standard (i.e., the measure used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics) and the economically disadvantaged standard (the standard used by the Office of Management and Budget) establish figures that increase with the size of the family. But the BLS standard also varies on the basis of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan residence whereas the OMB budget does not. Hence, the OMB standard in some circumstances is higher than

the BLS standard for small families but lower than the BLS standard for bigger families. As a result, "it is very difficult to juggle all of these variables—especially out in the field." These multiple criteria generated considerable confusion.

It is clear that the majority of the participating youth are from minority groups as nationally defined, although in each of these communities minority groups are either the majority of the population or very close to it. Also, most of the participants are in school at the high school level. The YETP figures are naturally biased to steer toward more participation by youth who are in school because the school systems are legislatively involved. By definition, their interest is toward serving school youth. At the same time, all groups are sensitive to the possibility that providing opportunities for out-of-school youth (younger than 18) might only encourage students to quit school. Designing adequate programs for out-of-school youth who are younger than 18, therefore, remains a serious policy problem.

It is no surprise, therefore, that few previously unemployed youth have been program participants (see tables 4 and 5). YEDPA, therefore, may have increased employment among youth but not have had much effect on youth unemployment. As most participants are school youth, many of the people who are attracted to the program are from the ranks of those who have never been in the labor force. The only exception was the YCCIP program in the Coastal Bend area.

In YCCIP, students currently enrolled in high school are the largest single group of participants in all three prime sponsor areas. In YETP high school students represent the majority in the Coastal Bend area and in El Paso, but in Albuquerque high school graduates were the dominant group. This exception reflects the focus of the prime sponsor's programs on skill training at its skills center or in direct placement with private training establishments and also reflects the city internship program for post-secondary school youth (which was not refunded for fiscal year 1979).

Hence, YEDPA has not made any appreciable headway in addressing all of the local needs as estimated in these communities. The best that can be said is that YEDPA may have prevented a bad situation from becoming worse. All three prime sponsors

have large numbers of unemployed and low-income persons. All have large youth populations. Although YEDPA has helped, it certainly has not reduced the magnitude of the youth employment problems in any of these communities.

Enrollment Activity

YEDPA was essentially an operational program for only six months of the first fifteen months of its life. Data presented by fiscal year quarter for YCCIP and YETP for each of the prime sponsors show that YEDPA activities did not begin in earnest until the third quarter of fiscal year 1978 (i.e., after April 1, 1978; see tables 7 and 8). The first quarter of 1979 (i.e., September 30, 1978, to December 1978) was a lost quarter because of reauthorization and funding uncertainties. In several instances no new enrollments occurred during the first quarter of fiscal year 1979, and most of those who were enrolled were carryovers.

As for program activity, table 7 clearly shows that all three prime sponsors relied exclusively upon work experience for YCCIP. In El Paso, the YCCIP portion of YEDPA that is sponsored by the El Paso Independent School District also awards academic credit for work experience. The school district has combined its YCCIP and YETP enrollees into essentially the same program.

The fact that YETP programs were at full strength for essentially only two quarters makes it virtually impossible to draw conclusions about trends. The variety of projects is reflected in the figures; work experience and career employment exploration dominated the activities. The largest program sponsor under YETP, of course, was the school systems, whose participation was mandated by the legislation. In El Paso and the Coastal Bend, the local education agencies (LEAs) accounted for most of the funds and the participants under YETP. In Albuquerque the activities were more diverse and LEA funds and participants were much more limited.

Substitution and Overhead

All three prime sponsors know that substitution is an important political and academic question; but, from their perspectives,

Table 7

Cumulative Enrollment by Program Activity by Fiscal Year Quarter for Youth Community Conservation Improvement Project Participants by Prime Sponsor

	Albuquerque				Coastal Bend				El Paso			
	1978*			1979*	1978*			1979*	1978*			1979*
Type of program	Quarter II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I
Classroom	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
On-the-job training	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Work experience	54	77	91	91	–	56	79	–	35	129	136	48
Vocational	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Career employment exploration	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Transition services	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Other	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

*Quarter II = January 1, 1978–March 31, 1978
Quarter III = April 1, 1978–June 30, 1978
Quarter IV = July 1, 1978–September 30, 1978
Quarter I = October 1, 1978–December 31, 1978

Table 8

Cumulative Enrollment by Program Activity by Fiscal Year Quarter for Youth Employment and Training Program by Prime Sponsor

Type of program	Albuquerque				Coastal Bend				El Paso			
	1978*			1979*	1978*			1979*	1978*			1979*
	Quarter II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I
Classroom	–	57	96	96	–	–	–	50	106	153	153	–
On-the-job training	–	8	22	22	–	17	34	16	–	9	9	–
Work experience	42	69	73	83	97	245	321	29	95	168	188	49
Vocational	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Career employment exploration	49	51	70	70	102	394	542	184	172	247	268	260
Transition services	–	40	91	104	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Other	–	55	103	104	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

*Quarter II = January 1, 1978–March 31, 1978
Quarter III = April 1, 1978–June 30, 1978
Quarter IV = July 1, 1978–September 30, 1978
Quarter I = October 1, 1978–December 31, 1978

each claims that local needs are so great that they see little reason why the issue should be controversial. (*Substitution* is a term that refers to whether or not a locality is merely replacing local government funds, which would have been expended anyway, with federal money, rather than using federal money for new functions. To the degree that substitution occurs, a program has less aggregate impact on the local economy and job market.) They claim they want to serve youth and YEDPA affords them the opportunity to do so. Nonetheless, all of the prime sponsors were aware that their service level in other CETA programs was under scrutiny during the year. No consistent pattern of youth participation in CETA Title I programs is apparent during fiscal year 1977 (the year before the passage of CETA) and fiscal year 1978 (the first year of YEDPA that was enacted under Title III of CETA; see table 9). All three prime sponsors had high levels of participation from youths under age 22 in fiscal year 1977. El Paso had the

Table 9

Enrollment of Youth in CETA Title I Programs for the First Quarter of Fiscal Years 1977, 1978, and 1979 by Prime Sponsor

Prime sponsor	1977				1978				1979
	Quarter I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I*
Albuquerque, N.M.									
Number of enrollees under age 22	517	743	1,282	1,641	683	862	1,065	1,220	340
Percentage of all Title I enrollees who were under age 22	58	51	43	42	52	48	44	39	62
Coastal Bend Manpower Consortium, Tex.									
Number of enrollees under age 22	728	1,256	1,751	2,260	676	863	1,082	1,251	341
Percentage of all Title I enrollees who were under age 22	53	49	47	46	69	66	63	63	49
El Paso, Tex.									
Number of enrollees under age 22	576	825	2,055	2,354	447	602	1,756	1,941	498
Percentage of all who were under age 22	62	57	73	72	58	57	74	68	57

*All three prime sponsors consider the first quarter of fiscal year 1979 to be a "lost quarter" because of the uncertainty of the reauthorization of CETA and further delays and uncertainties over funding levels. In many instances, there were freezes on CETA participation with only carryover participants enrolled in the program.

highest youth participation rate before the passage of YEDPA yet the percentage of youths in Title I during fiscal year 1978 generally exceeded the earlier levels. Albuquerque appears to be the only prime sponsor reporting a decline in youth enrollment in Title I. Since the patterns are erratic for all three sponsors and YEDPA was operational for only the third and fourth quarters of fiscal year 1978, a definitive conclusion about YEDPA's influence on youth enrollment in Title I in these three prime sponsorships cannot be drawn. This lack of a conclusion, however, is not a problem. In fact, the high youth enrollment levels in both Title I and Title III give credence to the contention of the prime sponsors that many more youths in their communities need CETA services.

Resources from other sources have augmented YEDPA funds to cover overhead costs in a number of instances. In some cases participants in public service employment programs under Title II or Title VI have been used as supervisors of YEDPA enrollees—especially in YCCIP. The general pattern, however, is much more complex. Most community action agencies, local education agencies, local government agencies, and community-based organizations involved in YEDPA are also involved in some way in other CETA programs. As a result, facilities, services, programs, administrators, and staffs often overlap. The schools in particular seem to contribute to nonchargeable overhead costs. Most of the noneducational agencies had been primarily concerned with providing services to adults before the passage of CETA. YEDPA has brought these organizations and their facilities and staffs into providing services for youths. Thus, it is not really possible to assign a magnitude to the overlap between programs other than to say that YEDPA appears to have been the beneficiary. The only group that has not contributed in any discernible manner has been the private sector. Neither unions nor business firms were noticeably involved in either the planning or implementation of YEDPA.

Institutional Change

Youth Offices

Before the creation of YEDPA, none of the three prime sponsors had a specific administrative agency dealing with youth.

During YEDPA's first year, the Albuquerque prime sponsor did establish a special youth office designed to be a comprehensive center with no delegation of duties to any other office in the city. Each youth who came into the office was assigned a counselor with whom all further contacts by the youth were made. The office was centrally located in the downtown area. The operation of the youth center, however, did not meet the expectations of the prime sponsor and, as a result, was put out to bid for fiscal year 1979. The Mid-Rio Grande Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC) was awarded the contract to run the office and was specifically assigned the duty of serving out-of-school youth. The location of the center was shifted to a low-income section of the city. The concept of a comprehensive youth center was lost with this change. For fiscal year 1979 the youth center was restricted to serving youths eligible for CETA. The administrative change can be partially attributed to a change in directors of the prime sponsor. The previous director had been very suspicious of community-based organizations and had preferred to keep program responsibilities within the control of the prime sponsor. The new director, who took office in June 1978, strongly favors delegation of operational duties. Also, some observers had thought that the original center had not been convenient for low-income youth. It is hoped that in fiscal year 1980 the youth center can again be set up to serve all youths in the city, but that eventuality will depend upon whether other funds can be obtained to finance added costs.

In El Paso, a youth division within the prime sponsor's offices is planned to deal explicitly with youth issues and youth programs. As of February 1978, however, the plans had not been acted upon. The Coastal Bend program does not have a youth office per se, but the Corpus Christi Independent School District does have a comprehensive youth program that existed before the establishment of YEDPA and was strengthened by YEDPA.

Private Sector

The least successful aspect of YEDPA's first year has been with its relations with the private sector. In El Paso, serious problems with unions during the beginning period of YEDPA delayed the start of a number of projects. An accommodation was eventually

reached in which the prime sponsor has, in essence, steered clear of any possible areas of potential conflict. In general, all of the prime sponsors are grateful that the unions are not more interested in YEDPA in their localities.

The prime sponsors regret that they have been unable—at least during the first year—to arouse more interest in the business community. In the Coastal Bend area, an on-the-job training (OJT) program with private industry was unsuccessful. Business firms simply were not interested in youths younger than age 18; and employer resistance to the program was strong. The GI Forum-Veterans Outreach Program, which was the operator of the OJT program, also blamed the schools for the poor job preparation of many youths. The organization admitted that it was business oriented and that it could not deal with poorly prepared youth on the job sites. Since all of the youth were out of school, many brought past problems with them to their jobs. Many youth were shocked by the routine of regular work and the job requirements of private employers and reacted badly. Many employers were also impatient with the youths and expected too much of them too soon. The spokesman of the Veterans Outreach Program also said that the youth council for YEDPA was dominated by public-sector representatives and that there is a chronic need for more private-sector input on these councils to help in designing programs that are more closely attuned to private needs. Nonetheless, the program was refunded for a second year and the officials believe that they are now more aware of the need for counseling and follow-up services for their participants. Although cautious, they do expect better results in the second year. In Albuquerque, OJT for youth met similar difficulties during the first year and was not pursued during the second year. One Albuquerque CETA official, however, did indicate that there may be another, more appropriate tack:

> The future of OJT for youth may hinge on what happens to the new Title VII of CETA (i.e., the Private Sector Initiative Program). Up until now, OJT for youth has been approached from the wrong end. We have been going to employers with OJT contracts in hand and saying take-it-or-leave-it. But Title VII offers the prospect that for the first time we will have dollars in hand that we can use to say to private employers 'how can we serve you.' We do not want to use traditional OJT for youth since it simply has not worked. Essenti-

ally we have been trying to shove our conception of what OJT should be down employer's throats. Title VII gives us a better opportunity.

Whether the new Title VII will actually develop to include youth, of course, remains to be seen.

In El Paso, a promising new twist for private-sector involvement in the programs administered by the El Paso Independent School District began in early 1979. The school system launched a new program that for the first time includes in YETP students in vocational and technical school. The students will attend regular classes part of the day and will work at job sites for the remainder. The twenty-four participants will work at private sector work sites in occupations for which they have already indicated a preference. The implicit objective is terminal placements after the students graduate. As the director of the program observed, "up until now we have been only placing youth at public sector job sites; but the public sector has no budget capacity to pick up their youth on this basis while the private sector does have the potential to absorb youth once they become productive." This program is seen as career exploration, rather than as OJT. The participants attend a special class for job skills and job habits and they receive two academic credits (on the quarter system), plus receiving an allowance equal to the federal minimum wage for the hours they work. The intention is to give the students actual experience at job sites until they become sufficiently productive for private employers to select them as permanent employees.

The only other private-sector program in the three prime sponsor areas was sponsored by the Albuquerque public schools using their entire YETP allocation to set up a special vocational education program with the local hospitality industry. This program also involved career exploration (the students are regularly rotated through various occupational positions). Students are paid a training allowance, attend a regular class in job preparation and self-awareness, and receive academic credit for their work experience. It is hoped that some of the participants will become permanent employees in the industry after they graduate.

Local Education Agencies

In all three prime sponsor areas the local school systems had extensive experience with Title I and SPEDY programs for youth

before the advent of YEDPA. Hence many of the reactions of the school officials to YEDPA also reflect more general experiences with youths in all youth programs under CETA.

The YEDPA planning cycles are not compatible with those of local schools. During the initial year, the schools in the three areas had to adjust to the YEDPA requirements; and, as a result, much unneeded ill will was generated and some delays could not be avoided. The need to appreciate the operational realities of local political institutions must be recognized in national manpower legislation. Not only are school districts required to have policy actions approved by local boards of education, but also, in some areas, local teacher organizations have contractual rights concerning staffing assignments and opportunities. That these formalities cannot be abridged was shown in Albuquerque where the teachers' collective bargaining agreement requires that all job openings be advertised for ten days and that present employees be given first consideration for these jobs; YEDPA was delayed by the need to follow these procedures. Haste to implement YEDPA did not result in any youth being employed any sooner than they would have if the local operational constraints had been recognized initially.

In all three localities academic credit for work experience is available for those endeavors involving LEAs. In Albuquerque, such programs had already existed. The only significant change was that the new program in the hospitality industry was restricted to economically disadvantaged youth. In El Paso, YEDPA clearly was instrumental in overcoming previous opposition to such programs at both the local and state levels. In the Coastal Bend, academic credit programs had been an integral part of the existing program before the introduction of YEDPA, but the development of similar programs in some of the rural independent school districts in the consortium's jurisdiction was made possible by YEDPA. Unfortunately, some of these new programs had to be cancelled during the first year because beginning funds were delayed and no effort was made to revive them.

School personnel perceive that CETA programs emphasize job placement (i.e., unsubsidized employment) but believe themselves that jobs for youth should be a means to an end (i.e., completion of at least a high school diploma) and not an end

in itself. The schools sense that prime sponsors are increasing pressure for job placement and for reduction of placement costs. As the dollars available for youth have increased (especially with the coming of YEDPA), the school systems have become more fearful about CETA goals for youth. While school officials see the answer to the problem of serving economically disadvantaged youth as bringing them back to classrooms rather than trying to get them immediate employment, they do not necessarily believe that a traditional school setting is needed. They also mean night classes, general equivalency diploma (GED) programs, alternative schools, and special schools for young mothers. They argue that if youths drop out of school it is far more costly to reach and to serve them than if they are able to receive quality preparation in school, to graduate, and then to be placed into permanent jobs. They see many of the jobs available under YEDPA as dead-end jobs. The preferences of school officials are continued education, continued training, and, last, job placement. To the degree that YEDPA allows youth to continue their education, school officials see it as an asset; to the degree that it stresses transition to jobs they see it as counterproductive.

Two of the LEAs developed entirely new programs. In Albuquerque, all stipulated funds were used to develop an academic credit program for economically disadvantaged youth with the hotel and motel industry. In El Paso, a new program was developed for in-school youth (both YETP and YCCIP youth) that provided part-time employment during the school year and full-time employment during the summer as well as academic credit.

Only in the Coastal Bend area were YETP funds used to expand and to elaborate upon a comprehensive program that was already in existence. The Corpus Christi Independent School District (CCISD) welcomed YEDPA. CCISD already had many of the programs that YEDPA wanted to encourage—an alternative school program for both junior and senior high students with school credit for work experience and an extensive GED program. CCISD officials believed that they had not only the accumulated experience with potential and actual school dropouts but also the available training facilities and staff.

CCISD, therefore, integrated its YETP effort into its existing PATHS program to identify and serve marginal school attenders

and achievers. (PATHS is an acronym for the words *prevention,* of school dropouts; *attraction,* of dropouts to school settings; *transition,* of out-of-school youngsters to jobs or to training; and *helping services,* of supportive assistance.) Since the youth are in transition, the goals of PATHS may be to lead participants to further education or to skill training or to direct job placement. Job placement itself, however, is not emphasized relative to the other program objectives. In rural areas, CCISD has had to tailor PATHS to the strengths of the local school districts. Most of these districts are small and they are unable to offer a variety of programs available in larger urban districts. Hence, CCISD concentrates on the existing vocational education, GED, or cooperative education programs. People in the rural areas seem to be more interested in work experience programs than in training or education endeavors since the chronic local problem is the shortage of jobs.

In conjunction with CCISD's efforts, LULAC (League of Latin American Citizens) Educational Service Center, a community-based organization, has a YETP contract to provide career education and self-awareness counseling to many of the youths enrolled in YETP. The participants in the CCISD program are given released work time to attend these special classes. The classes vary between 2 to 9 hours a quarter for each person. A mobile van takes materials into the rural areas.

In all three localities, prime sponsors had initial reservations regarding the mandated involvement and the specified minimum amount of funds (22 percent) of YETP funds available for the LEAs. Resistance to LEA involvement, however, was less than that to involvement of community-based organizations, perhaps because the public school systems are part of the permanent institutional structure of the local communities and because they too have responsibilities to local political entities.

Prime sponsors also expressed initial concern over legislative emphasis on assistance for in-school programs at the expense of requirements for out-of-school youth. Because out-of-school youth are those who the prime sponsors most often encounter, the sponsors believed that they had greater needs than the youths still in school. The prime sponsors believe that school systems

"tend to forget their failures—the dropouts—and are not really interested in serving them."

The mandated role of the LEAs in the legislation also triggered a more fundamental concern of the prime sponsors: what exactly is the intention of the YEDPA? By stressing the role of schools, the impression is that the goal is to get youth back into schools or into GED programs. The manpower programs run by schools are usually not geared toward job placement. Is YEDPA to be evaluated by job placement, which has been the traditional emphasis of the programs administered by the prime sponsors, or by the number of youth who return to the classroom, which is the usual focus of the school systems? While this question has yet to be clearly resolved in the minds of the prime sponsors, it has not been of immediate concern in the day-to-day operation of the YEDPA. Eventually, however, the issue of evaluation criteria must be resolved.

All of the major LEAs had had extensive experience with the CETA system before the introduction of YEDPA. All three LEAs are held in high esteem by their prime sponsors. In the Coastal Bend area and in El Paso, more than the minimum 22 percent of funds mandated by the act were given to the LEAs. Only in Albuquerque was the LEA given approximately the minimum amount, but this LEA also received a Tier II grant for an entitlement program (i.e., YIEPP) under YEDPA in addition to the funds received from YETP. Thus, the Albuquerque public schools received more YEDPA funds in the aggregate than did either of the other two LEAs.

All of the LEAs seemed more comfortable with YETP during the second year. The Albuquerque program is expanding to include a program in day care and child care that involves school-age mothers. The expansion of the El Paso program into the private sector was discussed earlier and the Coastal Bend is continuing to enrich its existing comprehensive program. No new difficulties arose in negotiating the second-year LEA agreements in any of the areas. Delayed funding and the lack of synchronization between the fiscal calendars of the Department of Labor and school districts were problems, but the schools are reluctantly adjusting to the peculiarities that are characteristic of all Department of Labor programs.

Community-based Organizations

All three prime sponsors initially opposed the emphasis of YEDPA on the involvement of community-based organizations. The issue was perceived as less of a potential problem in El Paso than it was in either Albuquerque or the Coastal Bend area.

At the beginning of YEDPA the life of community-based organizations was seen to be tied exclusively to federal dollars. Consequently, YEDPA was seen as being a natural magnet to attract these organizations, the implication being that short-term survival is their key concern and that "CBOs are definitely not the ultimate answer to youth employment problems."

The prime sponsors believed that community-based organizations could not be as successful in solving long-term problems as established local institutions and that ultimately the political officials of the locality are responsible for whether the programs accomplish anything or not. The political entities, of which the prime sponsors are often a part, were believed to be responsible for the decision as to who should perform which manpower activities. The prime sponsors believed it to be unfair that under the regulations of YEDPA they are held fiscally and politically accountable for what the community-based organizations do. The prime sponsors believed that they had the responsibility and the public accountability while the community-based organizations had the funds and the public relations credit.

The main concern of the prime sponsors, however, was with the actual ability of the organization to run successful programs. Community-based organizations were alleged to hire not because of their demonstrated abilities but because of their contacts. Also it was charged that the organizations tend to think in terms of the special communities they serve. For example, some prime sponsors feared that the staff of community-based organizations would think of youth programs in terms of increasing recreational activities to combat idleness and lessen delinquency problems; but, the spokesman observed, "recreational jobs don't lend themselves to good supervision nor do they provide gainful work experience." Past experience had shown that these organizations tended to favor such jobs as community aids or community developers that have absolutely no private-sector demand. Many also feared that the increased role of the organizations would add another

layer of administrative costs that would reduce the funds directly available for youths. This latter concern was also reflected by one LEA official who claimed that "most CBO's would have to start from point zero with respect to both facilities and staff to serve youths." He also contended that the YEDPA legislation required that program operators have proven records of experience with youth and that since these organizations have been chiefly concerned with adults to date, most could not meet that criterion.

Community-based organizations, however, became increasingly involved in the delivery of program services as YEDPA progressed. The organizations appear to concern themselves with servicing out-of-school youth in YETP or providing supportive services to programs run by the LEAs for in-school youth. The entire Albuquerque YCCIP grant for both years was awarded to Youth Development, Inc., a community-based organization, for a work experience program for in-school and out-of-school youth. The Coastal Bend consortium awarded almost all of its YCCIP grants to local government agencies for both years, and El Paso awarded most of its YCCIP funds to the local school system.

Since the second year of YEDPA does seem to reflect a larger role for community-based organizations, the prime sponsors seem either to have overcome their initial fears or to have resigned themselves to organization involvement. All three prime sponsors reported large sums of unspent funds at the end of fiscal year 1978, a serious problem that does give some credence to the fears of the sponsors. Part of this surplus was the result of the confusion and uncertainty about refunding of CETA, but part was also the result of the many community-based organizations in YEDPA (and in other CETA programs). The prime sponsors claim that it is very hard to track actual expenditure levels of community organizations until an accounting period is over; unspent funds, of course, mean that youths who could be were not served.

Changes at the Local Level

Before the establishment of YEDPA, a general consensus had been formed that youth were being squeezed out of CETA, which

was becoming increasingly categorized to serve adult groups—veterans, heads of households, and family heads receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children. YEDPA not only introduced another category, but also contained provisions requiring that past levels of youth activity be maintained while it provided new funds to serve more youth. The three prime sponsors under study appear to have done as they were requested. As a result the level of youth enrollees appears to have been increased substantially from what it would have been without YEDPA.

The focus on youth was also highly instructive to the prime sponsors and their planning councils because the complexity of youth labor markets became apparent to them. In the past, the schools were frequently merely targets of criticism, but by including them in YEDPA, the prime sponsors and their planning councils appear to have benefited from learning about what schools—especially the vocational education components—attempt to do.

The greatest institutional barrier to the success of YEDPA is the same as the one that impinges upon the youth labor market in general: the private sector—both business and unions—appears to have little interest in directly providing opportunities for youths. In the areas under study, the private sector was seldom involved. Institutional obstacles—such as insurance costs, minimum wage requirements, or worker compensation provisions—and attitudinal problems—complaints about the lack of attachment of youth to jobs or about deportment and lifestyle differences—increasingly have made the public sector responsible for providing jobs for minority youth. One planner cynically remarked that "the only time you can get private industry interested in youth problems is when there are public relations opportunities involved." Unions in the three areas either ignored YEDPA or criticized it. In El Paso serious problems were encountered during the start-up phase. Opposition was expressed to wage rates, job structures, length of training, and particular work projects. Much of the union opposition was more concerned with CETA in general than with YEDPA itself.

YEDPA gave more flexibility for program design than is the case with the other CETA titles. Also it permits the design of support services for the special needs of youths. Under the other

major CETA titles, youths were merely thrown in with the rest of the client populations. Hence, there are no indications that YEDPA in any way prevented the growth of any youth activities that might have occurred without it.

YEDPA may have had its greatest effect on the schools. It gave a strong prod to drop-out prevention and gave the schools funds to keep youth in school all year. It has also given crucial support to vocational education and job preparation in the schools and to counseling about both personal problems and job preparation. It has given strong support to nontraditional education to reach youth who would otherwise be discarded—to the movement for alternative schools, classes for school-aged parents, night schools, general equivalency diploma preparation, and cooperative education. While all of these existed in some form before the introduction of YEDPA, they received a boost from YEDPA. As one prime sponsor said, "YEDPA has given funds to schools to do things that have high public relations value and it has come at a time when the public image of the schools in this city desperately needs all the improvement it can get."

Federal Influences upon Local Planning and Legislative Uncertainties about CETA

Planning is a sensitive topic with the prime sponsors. YEDPA is an example of everything that is wrong with the prevailing employment and training system. No overall planning about objectives and program relations takes place nationally. As a result, local groups cannot plan. Essentially, the prime sponsors have become the implementers of programs despite the fact that all prime sponsors preferred to do planning.

To plan meaningfully at the local level, sponsors must know the regulatory requirements and dollar amounts associated with each program. Both were unknown when YEDPA ended its first year and preparations were being made for the second year. The fact that the entire CETA legislation was up for renewal (the final bill did not clear the Congress until October 15, 1978) made planning for fiscal year 1979 "more difficult than in other years." As a result, neither the funding levels nor the legislation was known until well after the fiscal year had begun. Under these

conditions it is impossible to tell subcontractors how much will actually be available for program operations. YCCIP was hit especially hard. It contained substantially fewer dollars than did YETP and was a casualty of the planning uncertainties. New YCCIP projects in the Coastal Bend consortium were postponed until after January 1, 1979. In El Paso, the YCCIP program run by the local school system ended its YCCIP participation on August 1, 1978, and did not enroll any new participants until mid-October 1978. In Albuquerque, the contract was renewed but the level of operations was reduced from the previous year.

Little local planning of any significance occurred during the second year of YEDPA. As one planner commented, "all we can do at the local level is cope with the situation and try to write decent applications." He added, "the funding and legislative uncertainties this year mean that most of our energies this year are going to be devoted to writing modifications to all existing contracts." He reiterated the fundamental local problem by saying:

> The Department of Labor (DOL) undoubtedly has its own pressures. But they simply do not understand the political pressures that prime sponsors are under. We must get approval of everything we do. The local political structures do not understand the way in which DOL operates and DOL does not understand that we cannot act without obtaining local approval from elected officials. They want to know every detail before they give approval. Unfortunately, we can only tell them things based upon a long list of confusing contingencies. The regional DOL office is concerned about the planning dilemma facing the prime sponsors but they have resigned themselves to the fact that it is a hopeless situation.

YEDPA was the center of attention when it first appeared, but by the end of its first year, other concerns had come to the fore. Efforts were made to monitor the separate YEDPA projects, but little time was given to evaluation, knowledge development, or planning for the second year. As one official lamented, "there is no sense of order in the programs that are coming from the Department of Labor; there is no recognition of the need to give time for growth and development of the existing programs; the prime sponsors are forced to devote their time and efforts to the short run concerns of the Department of Labor rather than to the long range objectives of what we are doing locally."

Response of Local Administrators to Federal Policy Direction

The prime sponsors seem to be adjusting to the role of being clerks for the Department of Labor. They may not like it, but they seem to have no other choice. YEDPA is but a continuation of the recategorization of the nation's employment and training system that was supposed to be decentralized when CETA was first enacted in 1973. YEDPA is a complex piece of legislation that places responsiblity for results on the prime sponsor but requires that many other local groups operate the programs. The prime sponsors are relegated to a minor support role. The CETA Amendments of 1978 go even further in this process.

The prime sponsors seem caught in a rather hopeless dilemma. All three are agencies of city governments. Each of these city governments is confronted with extensive problems of unemployment, poverty, delinquency, and growing youth populations. The city governments want federal dollars that can be used to reduce these problems. The federal government, on the other hand, has become increasingly specific in how its funds are to be used and who is to benefit. The prime sponsors, accordingly, may complain about their diminishing discretion but they are not in a position to refuse to participate or to protest too vehemently. They will comply with the directions that they are given by the federal government. As one planner quipped—"everything rolls down hill and we are the bottom."

As this gloomy administrative picture would lead one to expect, staff turnover, especially in YEDPA, has been extensive. In Albuquerque, the director of the prime sponsor was changed during the eighteen months of this study. Monitors for various youth programs in Albuquerque were also changed several times during this period. In both Albuquerque and El Paso, the persons in charge of the LEA programs were both changed after only one year. In all three areas planners assigned to YEDPA by prime sponsors and various project directors of community-based organizations or other groups who administered and who operated programs were changed several times. As a result, staff and program continuity are lacking. New people, who often must learn all over again, must be broken in often.

All of the prime sponsors carried over surplus YEDPA funds from fiscal year 1978 to fiscal year 1979. An indication of the magnitude of these funds can be seen from table 10. Part of the explanation is that the uncertainty over refunding for fiscal year 1979 led prime sponsors to reduce their funding levels prematurely. Part of the problem can also be attributed to the slow and often inadequate reporting of enrollment levels by the many delivery agencies that characterize YEDPA operations. Certainly some of the explanation must be found in the fact that the prime sponsors are becoming extremely cautious in their operations.

Thus, the question of local responsiveness to federal initiatives and federal mandates is essentially an academic point. Local agencies do respond. Whether better ways to enlist local prime sponsor involvement may be found is apparently not the relevent question to ask at this time.

Observations

The YEDPA focus on youth was welcomed by all of the prime sponsors. YEDPA has offered some opportunities for youths from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, has vividly demonstrated the complexity of the youth labor market, and has shown the necessity of developing special policy initiatives for youth.

The prime sponsors are now more knowledgeable about the multiple influences on youth employment patterns than they were when the act passed. They now sense the unique forces that influence both the demand and the supply of youth employment. They have found that most private employers—with a few exceptions—are not interested in employing youth unless they are older than 18. The reluctance is partly the result of the fact that

Table 10

Unspent YCCIP and YETP Funds from Fiscal Year 1978
(In dollars)

Area	YCCIP	YETP
Albuquerque	14,290	166,000
Coastal Bend	50,388	126,549
El Paso	111,852	273,649

many youth are poorly prepared for jobs and partly the result of institutional obstacles (i.e., insurance costs, special driver's license requirements, minimum wage, etc.). Prime sponsors now believe that anytime an employer is given a choice between an adult and a youth for a full-time job the adult will be chosen. They are also now more aware of the fact that many employers cannot or will not relate to youth because of what employers perceive as life-style differences and a lack of serious commitment to the job market on the part of youth.

On the supply side a host of behavioral factors affect the actions of young people. Youths are more likely to be influenced by their parents and by peer groups than are adults. Many youths have serious social problems—broken homes, alcoholism problems (of parents and sometimes of the youth themselves), drug problems, glue sniffing, child abuse, child neglect, and, sometimes, incest. Although these problems are especially severe among economically disadvantaged youth, they are not restricted to them. School officials, of course, have long known of the importance of these factors and have stressed the importance of supportive services for youth more than prime sponsors have in the past. School officials have also pressed the case for the involvement of other community institutions—such as halfway houses, welfare case workers, and juvenile court personnel. School officials stress the outreach of these organizations in their efforts to bring youths back to school. YEDPA has forced the prime sponsors and their staffs to recognize the merits of these considerations. As one official in Albuquerque admitted:

> Usually government attacks social and economic problems from the wrong end. In the past in the manpower field we have focused on older workers with poor skills and poor educational backgrounds. The emphasis on youth under YEDPA for the first time gives us the chance to act in a preventive role. I cannot help but feel that we would have been much better off today if MDTA [i.e., the Manpower and Development and Training Act of 1962] had started out serving youth as the primary target group back in the early 1960's.

YEDPA has some latitude in its eligibility criteria for the YETP program. Although all prime sponsors did focus upon economically disadvantaged youth, under CETA a number of really needy people in the past had not been eligible and could not be served:

for example, youths whose family income may be just slightly above the poverty threshold but whose parent may be dying of a terminal disease and deeply in debt with accumulated medical bills. They also cite the case of youths who come from families whose income is above the poverty threshold but who may have been thrown out of the house. Under CETA, these youth could not be served but under YETP they can be.

YEDPA has shown the importance of preparing policy initiatives especially for youths. Because they are in transition from dependency on their families to independence as future adult workers, youths often require special program initiatives and special links with other societal institutions. Most notable of these, of course, are the schools. The focus of CETA on job placement per se is clearly at odds with the concerns of the schools that education and training should be the primary consideration for those younger than age 18. Jobs and work experience may be necessary components of youth programs but it is an emerging consensus that they should be subsidiary to the primary goals of education. The prime sponsors seem to be adjusting to this idea but it may take more time until policy makers in both Congress and the Department of Labor are actually convinced. Youth programs also produce a number of intangible benefits—for example, the development of good work habits and a reduction in school dropouts. Over the long run these benefits may be far more important than merely reducing youth unemployment or creating new jobs. The experience to date, however, would indicate a need for more flexibility both in the evaluation of the performance of youth programs and in the types of program initiatives that are encouraged and supported.

The design of programs for youth is complicated by many unique factors that are not present to the same degree in programs for adult workers. For instance, one prime sponsor indicated that placing female youths in OJT slots had been a problem because of "lecherous employers" who made sexual advances. The official stated that "this is a very serious issue for a local prime sponsor to handle—especially if the girl is still living at home with her father." He added that "this type of an issue is a real problem that we must take into consideration even though upper level program administrators don't consider it to be a significant issue." Another

unexpected problem has been the objections of some boyfriends to their girlfriends working on sites where there are young men. These incidents, although obviously isolated, remind policymakers of some of the subtle issues that affect policy initiatives for youths.

Thus YEDPA has clearly proven to be a useful learning experience for the local prime sponsors. Its first year, however, contained many diversions regarding the uncertainties of CETA reauthorization and refunding as well as mandated attention to other programs (e.g., public service employment and a special program for disabled veterans). Functioning in crises is, of course, the usual experience of prime sponsors. Many of the real insights of the YEDPA experience have probably not yet been sufficiently recognized and the full potential of these programs not yet fully realized.

Notes

1. A major portion of the field work for this study involved personal interviews with officials associated with local governments, schools, businesses, unions, community groups, and civil rights groups as well as with youths employed in the various programs. So their responses would be frank and candid, these people were assured that they would not be identified. Hence, unidentified quotations occur throughout this manuscript. This convention is followed even where the sources expressed no reservations. The quotations are, in the author's opinion, immensely helpful in clarifying a situation and showing why a particular course of action was followed.
2. Although YIEPP is part of YEDPA, it is not a subject of the present study except as it may impinge upon the youth programs that are under review. YIEPP is a job-guarantee program for low-income youth who stay in school or return to school. Tier II refers to grants in the range of a million dollars or so, as opposed to Tier I grants, which were multimillion-dollar grants.

New Publications

The Coastal Energy Impact Program in Texas

Manners, Ian R. Summer 1980. $5.00 plus tax.

The author outlines the role and use of federal funds for energy impact assessment and mitigation along the Texas Gulf Coast. A central focus is his evaluation of planning strategies of coastal communities.

Electronic Funds Transference in Texas: The Stage of Its Development and Outlook for the 1980s

Crum, Lawrence L. Spring 1980. $4.00 plus tax.

The author describes developments in electronic banking in Texas during the 1970s and discusses factors likely to affect the progress of electronic banking in the 1980s.

Economic and Business Issues of the 1980s

Pluta, Joseph E., ed. Summer 1980. $7.00 plus tax.

A collection of articles designed to provide a capsule analysis of the Texas economy and business scene. Sections emphasize the general economic and market conditions, industrial location, labor and employment issues, the small business, industry case studies, and public/private sector interactions.

The Energy Picture: Problems and Prospects

Pluta, Joseph E., ed. Fall 1980. $6.00 plus tax.

A collection of articles covering all aspects of current energy policy.

The Gross Regional Product of Texas and Its Regions

Plaut, Thomas R., and Mildred C. Anderson. Fall 1980. $6.00 plus tax.

The study offers quarterly estimates of Texas gross regional product from 1958 to 1979 and annual estimates from 1965 to 1977 for the 24 Texas planning regions. Accompanying the estimates are analyses of trends in growth of output as well as in the structure of production.

Bureau of Business Research
P.O. Box 7459 • Austin, Texas 78712